



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

FISH & RICHARDSON PC
255 FRANKLIN ST
BOSTON MA 02110

COPY MAILED

MAY 17 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Choi, et al.
Application No. 09/888,114
Filed: June 22, 2001
Attorney Docket No. IMMR032/03US

DECISION ON PETITION

This is a decision on the renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3), filed November 4, 2004, which is also being treated as a petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6), to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. 120 and 365(c) for the benefit of nonprovisional applications 09/829,405 and 09/598,089, and international application PCT/US01/19625, and to accept an unintentionally delayed claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) for the benefit of provisional application 60/283,976.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after the expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii). In addition, the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) and CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(i) and 1.78(a)(5)(i) of the prior-filed application(s), unless

previously submitted;¹

(2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and

(3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

A reference to add the above-noted , prior-filed applications on page one following the first sentence of the specification has been included in a concurrently filed amendment. However, the amendment is not acceptable as drafted since it improperly incorporates by reference the prior-filed applications. Petitioner's attention is directed to Dart Industries v. Banner, 636 F.2d 684, 207 USPQ 273 (C.A.D.C. 1980), where the court drew a distinction between a permissible 35 U.S.C. 120 statement and the impermissible introduction of new matter by way of incorporation by reference in a 35 U.S.C. 120 statement. The court specifically stated:

Section 120 merely provides a mechanism whereby an application becomes entitled to benefit of the filing date of an earlier application disclosing the same subject matter. Common subject matter must be disclosed, in both applications, either specifically or by an express incorporation-by-reference of prior disclosed subject matter. Nothing in section 120 itself operates to carry forward any disclosure from an earlier application. In re deSeversky, supra at 674, 177 USPQ at 146-147. Section 120 contains no magical disclosure-augmenting powers able to pierce new matter barriers. It cannot, therefore, "limit" the absolute and express prohibition against new matter contained in section 251.

In order for the incorporation by reference statement to be effective as a proper safeguard against the omission of a portion of a prior application, the incorporation by reference statement must be included in the specification-as-filed, or in an amendment specifically referred to in an oath or declaration executing the application. See

¹ Any nonprovisional application or international application designating the United States of America claiming the benefit of one or more prior-filed copending applications or international applications designating the United States of America must contain or be amended to contain a reference (amendment to the first line of the specification following the title or in an application data sheet (ADS) to each such prior-filed application, identifying it by application number (consisting of the series code and serial number) or international application number and international filing date and indicating the relationship of the applications. Cross references to other related applications may be made when appropriate (see § 1.14).

In re deSeversky, supra. See also MPEP 201.06(c).

Accordingly, before the instant petition can be granted, a substitute amendment² deleting the incorporation by reference statement, along with a renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) is required.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Mail Stop Petitions
 Commissioner for Patents
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria VA 22313-1450

By FAX: (703) 872-9306
 Attn: Office of Petitions

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter should be directed to Petitions Attorney Cliff Congo at (571)272-3207.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Charles Pearson', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Charles Pearson
Director
Office of Petitions

² See 37 CFR 1.121